



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,672	02/20/2004	Beverly M. Emerson	SLK-2019-UT	7761

35938 7590 02/10/2006

BIOTECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP
527 N HIGHWAY 101
SUITE E
SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075-1173

EXAMINER

BURKHART, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1633

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,672

Applicant(s)

EMERSON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Burkhart

Art Unit

1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to methods of identifying a compound that modulates gene expression, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claims 9-10, drawn to methods of identifying a compound that modulates gene expression, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- III. Claims 11-15, drawn to methods of identifying a compound that modulates gene expression, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- IV. Claim 16, drawn to compounds identified by the methods of Group I, cannot be classified, no compound disclosed.
- V. Claim 17, drawn to compounds identified by the methods of Group II, cannot be classified, no compound disclosed.
- VI. Claim 18, drawn to compounds identified by the methods of Group III, cannot be classified, no compound disclosed.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II and III are biologically and functionally distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The methods of Group I and II comprise the use of a different ATPase (BRG-1) that is not used in the method of Group III, which uses the BRM ATPase. Groups I and II use different transcription factors: Group I is limited to those containing tryptophan clusters or leucine zippers and Group II to particular motifs from a zinc

Art Unit: 1633

finger domain. The end result of the methods are different: each would identify different compounds that modulate gene expression because of the use of different components. For example, the use of different transcription factors would regulate the use of different genes, therefore identifying different compounds. Thus, the operation, function, and effects of these different methods are different and distinct from each other. Therefore, the inventions are capable of supporting separate patents.

Inventions I, II and III are related to Inventions IV-VI, respectively, as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the screening methods of Groups I, II and III could be practiced with any of a range of compounds (e.g. any of those listed in ¶ [0090], page 35, such as fatty acids, purines, antibodies, etc.), not just those potentially identified in claims 16-18. The compounds of Group IV-VI could be used in the therapy of symptoms and diseases based on transcription factor dysfunction, such as obesity and diabetes (see page 16, ¶'s [0046-0047] of the specification).

Inventions IV, V and VI are chemically, biologically and functionally distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The compounds are all produced by distinct methods (i.e. the methods of Groups I-III) using distinct reagents such as different transcription factors and ATPases. Thus, any compound identified using one of the methods would not necessarily be identified in one of the other methods because the particular structure of the compound renders it non-functional in the different method (e.g. it does not bind to the

Art Unit: 1633

different transcription factor used in the method). Furthermore, the composition(s) of each group is not needed to produce the compositions of the other groups (which can be identified separately without the need for the compositions of the other groups). Therefore, the inventions of the groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Groups II, III, IV, V or VI, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Claims 1 and 2 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising the transcription factor(s) used: c-fos; c-jun; C/EBP α ; CREB; or IRF-1. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141 . If claims are added after

Art Unit: 1633

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined

Art Unit: 1633

claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Burkhart whose telephone number is (571) 272-2915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-0731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael D. Burkhart
Examiner
Art Unit 1633



SCOTT D. PRIEBE, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER